A

LETTER

TO

Dr. Sherlock,

In Vindication of that part of

Josephus's History,

Which gives an Account of *Iaddus* the High-Priest's submitting to *Alexander* the Great while *Darius* was living.

Against the

ANSWER

To the Piece Intituled,

Obedience and Submission to the Present Government.

LONDON,

Printed for *Thomas Jones* at the *White-Horse* without *Temple-Bar*. MDCXCI.

A

LETTER

TO

Dr. SHERLOCK,

In Vindication of his late Book, Entituled,

The CASE *of* ALLEGIANCE.

A

LETTER

TO

Dr. Sherlock,

In Vindication of that part of

Josephus's History,

Which gives an Account of *Iaddus* the High-Priest's submitting to *Alexander* the Great while *Darius* was living.

Against the

ANSWER

To the Piece Intituled,

Obedience and Submission to the Present Government.

LONDON,

Printed for *Thomas Jones* at the *White-Horse* without *Temple-Bar*. MDCXCI.

A

LETTER

TO

Dr. Sherlock,

In Vindication of that part of

Josephus's History,

Which gives an Account of [illegible]
ting to Alexander the Great with [illegible]

ANSWER

[illegible]

[illegible]

A LETTER TO Dr. Sherlock, &c.

SIR,

YOu desire to know what I have to say to the Objections that are made by a late Writer against the Authority of *Josephus*, in what he says concerning the Submission that was made to *Alexander* the Great by *Jaddus* the High-Priest of the Jews, and against the use that is made of it by some that have written in Defence of the Oath of Allegiance to Their Majesties.

First, Against the Story it self; the Objector saith, *It is very suspitious*, on two accounts: First, That *no Author besides Josephus* and his Followers, *mention any such thing. Secondly*, He sets forth the *difficulty of reconciling it with Chronology:* To which he adds, That there are *several Inconsistences* in the Story it self.

Secondly, The Objector saith, That *if the Story were true, yet it would not prove the Point for which it is alledged.*

To consider what he bringeth under these Heads, we shall begin with what he saith of the *suspiciousness* of the Story. To prove this charge, his first Argument is, because *no Author besides* Josephus, and those that had it from him, *mentions or takes notice of any such thing.*

This Argument lyes against all that *Josephus* has written of the *Jewish* Affairs, within the Historical time of the Heathens, except what he takes out of *Scripture*, or out of the Books of the *Maccabees*; for we have no other Ancient *Jewish* History. If there had been any other *Jewish* Historian that had written the things of *Alexander*'s time, and said nothing of this Story of *Jaddus*, nor of *Jaddus* himself, (for his living then is questioned by our Objector,) then indeed there had been great occasion to say, that their silence had made this Story suspicious. But when there is no *Jewish* Writer that pretends to write a History of those Times, in this case to argue against the Authority of *Josephus*, only from the silence of *Heathen* Historians; this seems to be very unjust and unreasonable. Who knows not that the *Heathens* generally contemned and hated the *Jews*, as being not only Revilers of their Gods, but Enemies to all the rest of Mankind? Hence it came to pass, that those Writers he mentions, have scarce ever named the *Jews* in their Histories. But *Josephus* design'd nothing more than to give us a History of the *Jews*. How then should his Credit be impeacht by the silence of *Heathen* Writers? Especially in a Matter which they would be sure to conceal, for that very reason that he had to mention it, namely, because it made for the honour of his Nation.

It was the same reason, that they had to pass by all the Miracles of Christ and his Apostles. Should we therefore grant the Story of these to be *suspicious*, because the *Heathen* Writers of those times *take no notice of any such thing?*

We

We ought to take heed of ſuch Arguments as an Adverſary may make uſe of againſt the Goſpel it ſelf.

But if it were true that our Objector here ſays, that thoſe *Heathens tell us the clean contrary* to that which we have from *Joſephus*, there might be ſomething in this contradiction, tho not in the ſilence of *Heathen* Writers. But perhaps the Objector might mean, that the Account of thoſe Hiſtorians is contrary to that of the Author, againſt whom he writes. For this Author, as he cites him, (I know not how truly,) ſaith, That from *Tyre Alexander came directly to* Jeruſalem. That indeed doth not agree with the account that is given us by the Hiſtorians he mentions. But *Joſephus* doth not ſay this: He tells us, That *Alexander* having beſieg'd *Tyre* ſeven months, and then taken it, came forward to *Gaza*, and took it after a Siege of two months; and then haſtened to *Jeruſalem*, which ſubmitted to him, as alſo did the Neighbouring Cities. This conſiſts very well with what we read in thoſe Hiſtorians: For tho they agree, that from *Tyre* he went directly to *Gaza*, yet after the taking of that City, they do not ſay that he went preſently into *Egypt*; He might ſtay long enough to go to *Jeruſalem*, which was about Fifty miles diſtant, and receive the Submiſſion of that and the Neighbouring Cities, before he went into *Egypt*. I ſay he might well do this, according to *Diodor*'s Account, who ſaith, * That *having ſettled things about Gaza*, afterwards he ſent away *Amyntas* with ten Ships for *Macedonia*, and then went with his Army into *Egypt*. This being not contrary, but very conſiſtent with the Account that we have from *Joſephus*, there is no farther cauſe of *ſuſpicion* on this head.

* *Diodor. Sic. Edit.* 1559. p. 566. τὰ περὶ τὴν Γάζαν διοικήσας.

The next is the *difficulty of reconciling it with Chronology*; Nay, this is not all the Objector tells us, for he ſaith afterwards, there are *difficulties that have perplext all*

* p. 11. *Chronologers*: And at laſt, * There are *inſuperable difficulties* in this Story. Where are they? For I confeſs I do not ſee any difficulty. He tells us, in the Ages of the perſons, *pag.* 9. *Mighty Ages, not in the leaſt mentioned by any Hiſtorian:* Namely, *that* Sanballat *lived to above* 145, *and* Jaddus *to above* 124 *years of age.*

But doth *Joſephus ſay this?* Not in words, nothing like it. But it muſt come to this, if the Objector reckon true. And if he miſreckons for *Joſephus*, he deals as ill with the Scripture, only he doth not charge it with *ſuſpition* on this account. But according to the Scripture, as he underſtands it, *Ezra* muſt have lived to a much greater Age than either of thoſe before mentioned.

* p. 17. The Objector * will have *Ezra* born about ſix years before the *Babylonian* Captivity, and to have ſeen the firſt Temple yet ſtanding; and 59 Years after this, *viz.* in the firſt year of *Cyrus*, to have return'd from the Captivity. So that then *Ezra* was 65 years of Age by his reckoning: From thence to the ſeventh year of *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, are ſeventy nine years; ſo that then *Ezra* muſt have been One hundred and fourty four years of age, according to our Objectors account. And yet it is certain, that in that year of *Artaxerxes*, *Ezra* made a Journey from *Babylon* to *Jeru-*
* *Ezr.* 7. *ſalem* *; and it is as certain, that he lived 13 years after that, namely till the 20*th.* of *Artaxerxes*; and then, according to our Objector, he muſt have been 157 years of age;
* *Neh.* 12. 36, 37. and yet, as old as he was, that very year * he led the Proceſſion up Stairs and down Stairs about the Wall of *Jeruſalem*. He might live many Years after this, as we may judge by his ſtrength of Body in that Exerciſe. But if he dyed that year, being 157 years old, as he muſt be by the Objectors reckoning; he that finds no difficulty in this, or takes no notice of it, for fear of reflecting upon Scripture, ought not to call that Story in *Joſephus Suſpitious*, becauſe

becauſe of the *difficulty of reconciling it with Chronology.*

But in vain do Men talk of *reconciling* Differences, where there are none but of their own making. They that take *Ezra* to have been born before the Captivity, judge ſo for this * reaſon; becauſe it is ſaid, That he was the Son of *Seraia* the High-Prieſt, that was kill'd before the Captivity: But in like manner, *Seraia* is there made * the 17*th.* from *Aaron*, that lived near a thouſand years before. The meaning of theſe words is, that *Seraia* was deſcended from *Aaron*, (and ſo *Ezra* was from *Seraia*,) not immediatly, but with others between, that are not mentioned. And ſo *Johanan* the High-Prieſt is called * the Son of *Eliaſhib*, who indeed was his Grand-Father, and his Father was * *Jehoiada*, that is not there mentioned. This is a common way of ſhortning Pedegrees, which if the Objector had conſidered, he would not have run himſelf into that difficulty of *Ezra*'s Age, which, tho he takes no notice of it, is much greater than thoſe are of which he complains.

* p. 8.

* Ezr. 7. 1. &c.

* Neh. 12. 23.

* 12. 10.

And yet theſe that he complains of are Difficulties of his own making, and proceed only from an eager deſire to find faults in that Story in *Joſephus*. If this had not blinded his Eyes, he might have ſeen, that, admitting that Story to be true, yet there was no neceſſity of making either *Jaddus* or *Sanballat* live to ſo great an Age.

Firſt for *Jaddus*, who (as he ſaith) muſt have been 124 years old at the taking of *Tyre*, the Objector proves his Age by theſe ſteps.

Firſt he takes it for granted, that *Jaddus* was High-Prieſt at the time when the Book of *Nehemiah* was written; but he takes this only as * *probable*, and therefore by his own confeſſion, all can be but probable that he builds on it.

* p. 7.

Next for the time when that Book was written, it muſt have been before *Nehemiah* dyed; that is certain. But when did he dye? The Objector tells us from *Briet*, that

that he died the laſt year of *Longimanus*, who reigned 41 Years. But to what end doth he tell us this? For he himſelf could not believe it, as appears by his Words. For
P. 7. ſaith he, *I think the leaſt we can allow for the time of* Nehemiah's *living after he ended his Book, is* 30 *Years*; *and it is very probable it was much more.* Well, ſay but 30 Years, and account that upward from the time of his death according to *Briet*; and then *Nehemiah*'s Writing of his Book will be in the *11th.* Year of *Artaxerxes*, that is, his Book was written 9 Years before any of thoſe things happened that are written in it. Now this I think the Objector could not mean, and therefore he doth but amuſe us with that idle Quotation.

Howſoever, as if he had prov'd ſomething by this, he infers from it (I know not how) that *Jaddus* was High-Prieſt the laſt Year of *Artaxerxes*. Grant him this, and he has no more to ask. For then, *Jaddus* being 30 years old, *to this add* 94 (which is the time from the death of *Artaxerxes*, till *Alexander*'s coming to *Jeruſalem*,) *and then* Jaddus, *at that time* Joſephus *faſtens this Story, muſt have been* 124 *years old.* Q. E. D.

But tho I do not ſee which way he proves this, I ſee very clear Reaſons to the contrary, which I think are unanſwerable.

Firſt, That the Book of *Nehemiah* was not written, till after the death of *Artaxerxes Longimanus*: *Secondly*, That *Jaddus* was not High-Prieſt at the Death of *Artaxerxes*; nor probably born then, nor long after, till the end of *Darius Nothus*.

Firſt, That *Nehemiah* did not write in any part of *Artaxerxes*'s Reign, but either in or after the time of *Darius* his immediate Succeſſor: This is certain; For in his Book
* *Neh.* 12. 22. he mentions * the Reign of *Darius* the *Perſian*. I think none will ſay he did this by the Spirit of Prophecy. But to come

come nearer the point, I inſiſt upon it, that he writ **after** the Reign of *Darius*. So the *Hebrew* words ſhew, that he writ when that Reign was expired; for there it is ſaid, That the Heads of the *Levites*, and alſo the Prieſts, *were recorded*, על־מלכות דריוש **over** or *throughout* the Reign of *Darius*. It appears, that the words are ſo to be underſtood, by what followeth in the next Verſe, where it is ſaid, that the Heads of the *Levites* were recorded in the Book of the Chronicles עד־ימי יוחנן till the days of *Johanan*, that is, till he came to be High-Prieſt. I take *Nehemiah*'s meaning in thoſe two * Verſes, to be thus in ſhort: Having given account * of the Heads of the Prieſts that were in the time of *Jeſhua* the High-Prieſt, and afterwards ‖ of them that were in the time of his Son *Joiakim*; having alſo given account ‖ of the Heads of the *Levites* that were in *Joiakim*'s time; he thought ſome account would be expected of them that were in the days of the following High-Prieſts: Therefore he inſerted theſe * two Verſes, wherein he tells us, That as for the *Levites* that were in the days of *Eliaſhib*, *Joiada*, *Johanan*, and *Jaddua*, the Heads of thoſe *Levites*, and alſo the Prieſts, all that were in the Reign of *Darius Nothus*, were recorded in the Book of *Chronicles*; but afterwards the Prieſts were not recorded, but only the Heads of the *Levites*; and thoſe, only during the High-Prieſthood of *Eliaſhib* and *Joiada* who were then dead, but not of *Johanan*, who it ſeems was then newly come to be High-Prieſt, when this Book was written. As for *Jaddua*, he is mentioned, both ‖ here, and before ‖ in this Chapter, not as being High-Prieſt then, (how could he in his Fathers *days?*) but only as being then living, and Heir apparent of the High-Prieſthood; ſo the words are underſtood by the moſt Learned ‖ Primate, who was as well a great Chronologer, as a good Textuary.

* v. 22, 23. * *Neh.* 12. 1, 7. ‖ v. 12. 21. ‖ v. 8, 9. & 24, 25, 26. * v. 22, 23. ‖ v. 22. ‖ v. 10. ‖ *Uſſer. Ann. A. M.* 3589.

It may be ſaid, that if this Interpretation be true, *Nehemiah*

miah must have lived to a very great Age. No doubt he did so; for he was Cup-bearer to King *Artaxerxes*, in the 20*th*. year of his Reign. We may suppose *Nehemiah* to have been then about 25 years of Age; after that, he lived to see the High Priesthood pass from Father to Son for four Generations: And he saw a fifth coming in view, namely *Jaddua*, whom we suppose to have been then about 30 years old. All this might very well be, if *Nehemiah* were born 470 years before Christ, and writ in the year 347 before Christ. Then he was about 104 years old according to our reckoning, which is not so incredible an Age, as that of *Ezra*'s being 157 years old when he went in that clambering Procession according to the account of our Objector.

Secondly, For *Jaddus* his being High-Priest at the time of *Artaxerxes*'s Death, which our Objector makes the ground of his Calculation, I have shewn he has no ground for his affirming of this, and that might suffice for an Answer. But besides, that it is groundless, it is also highly improbable. For if this had been true, there must have been living and dying no less than 5 High Priests in one direct Line, from Father to Son, in the space of two and twenty years.

First, His Grand-Fathers Grand-Father *Joiakim*, was
¶ *Neh.* 12. 28. High-Priest within the time while *Nehemiah* ¶ was Governour; that is certain. But his Government began in the twentieth year of *Artaxerxes*. It appears, that *Joiakim*
‖ *Neh.* 13. 1. dyed the same year; for his Son *Eliashib* ‖ was High Priest at the time when the Wall of *Jerusalem* was building. And
‖ *Neh.* 13. 28. he was High Priest ‖ in the 32*d*. year of *Artaxerxes*. *Eliashib* continued much longer, as I understand it; but suppose he dyed that very year, there must be some time allowed for his Son *Joiada* after him, and then for his Grand-Child *Johanan*; for both these were High-Priests, as has been

been already ſhewn. But after the 32*d.* of *Artaxerxes*, there were but eight years more before the end of his Reign. We have ſcarce known a Change of five Popes in the time that this Objector allows for ſo many to come and go in a Hereditary Succeſſion: And then the Age of *Jaddus* being conſidered, (of which our Objector ſaith when he came to be High-Prieſt, *The leaſt we can allow is 30 years, and it is very probable it was much more:*) If it was but 30 years, then the Age of *Joiakim* when he dyed, muſt have been at leaſt 90 years; his Son *Eliaſhib* at leaſt 62; his Son *Joiada* near 70; his Son *Johanan* near 60; and each of theſe, as the Objector ſaith, *it is very probable much more*; and four of theſe muſt have been born when their Fathers were but 20 years old. If any one of theſe things did not happen, then our Objectors ground-work fails; but that all things happen'd thus, I think there is no probability.

But on the other hand, there is nothing improbable in that Account which I offer'd before: *Jaddus* might have been born any year before his Father *Johanan* came to be High-Prieſt, (at which time I conceive with very good ground the Book of *Nehemiah* was written;) and yet *Jaddus* might have been mention'd as he is in that Book. But I ſuppoſed him born 30 years before, in compliance with the moſt Learned Primate, who || reckons that *Jaddus* might be about 83 years old at his Death. So he judged by comparing the Scripture together with *Joſephus*'s Antiquities. I attribute very much to his judgment in theſe Matters: But not to reſt upon that only, I have alſo conſider'd the years of the High-Prieſts above-mentioned. They are recorded in the *Chronicon Paſchale*; but I think better in *Georgius Syncellus*; who tho he doth not quote his Author, yet is reaſonably preſumed to have tranſcribed them from *Julius Africanus*; an Author that lived little more than 100 years after *Joſephus*, and living in the ſame Country,

|| *Uſſer. Annal.* A.M. 3602

might have his Information from them that knew as well as *Iosephus* himself. In placing the years of these Priests, I begin from the Death of *Jaddus*, who is ‖ said ‖ to have died about the same time with *Alexander* the Great: Reckoning from thence upwards, the Death of *Joiakim* will fall in the 20*th.* year of *Artaxerxes*; which exactly agreeth with the Account of his Death that I have given from Scripture. And indeed there is nothing said of any of these Priests, either in the Holy Scripture, or in *Josephus*, but what very well consists with the Account of their years that is given us in this Catalogue. That you may the better judge of this, I have given you a short view of their Years, compared with those of the Kings of *Persia*, as they are in *Ptolomy*'s *Canon*.

‖ *Jos. Ant. xi. ending.*

Yaars before Christ.	Beginnings of *Persian* Kings, and of *Iewish* High-Priests.
445 —	In *Nisan Nehemia* came from *Susa* for *Jerusalem*: After his coming thither *Joiakim* dies.
444 —	His Son *Eliashib* High-Priest, 34 y.
424 —	DARIUS *Nothus*, 19 y.
410 —	*Ioiada*, 36 y.
405 —	*Iaddus* born.
	ARTAXERXES *Mnemon*, 46 y.
374 —	*Iohanan* 32 y. *Nehemiah* writ his Book.
	In *Iohanan*'s time *Bagoses* was Governour.
359 —	OCHUS, 21 y.
342 —	*Iaddus*, 20 y.
338 —	ARSES, 2 y.
336 —	DARIUS *Codomannus*, 4 y.
	He sent *Sanballat* to *Samaria*.
332 —	ALEXANDER takes *Tyre* and *Gaza*.
	Ierusalem yields to him.
330 —	*Darius* dies.
323 —	*Alexander* dies, and *Iaddus*.

Having

Having ſhewn that the Age of *Iaddus* has no difficulty in it, we are next to conſider what there is in the Ages of *Sanballat* and *Manaſſes*.

For the firſt of theſe, he is ſpoken of by *Ioſephus*, with that care which one would have thought might have prevented this Objection. For whereas the Objector proceeds upon a ſuppoſition, that the *Sanballat* in *Ioſephus*, is the ſame that was the Adverſary of the *Iews* in the twentieth year of *Artaxerxes*; and if that were true, then indeed he muſt have been (as the Objector would have him,) much above 120 years old in *Alexander*'s time; to prevent all ſuſpicion of this, *Ioſephus* deſcribed him by thoſe Characters by which we may be ſure he was not the ſame *Sanballat*. However, the Objector is pleaſed to (*a*) ſay, That *Ioſephus doth not intimate any ſuch thing*; he doth more than intimate, he tells us plainly in his Deſcription; Firſt, That this was a *Chuthæan*, of that Race from which the *Samaritanes* came, that (*b*) is, from *Chutha* beyond the river *Euphrates*; and farther, (*c*) that this Man was ſent to be Governour of *Samaria* by the laſt *Darius*, who was driven out by *Alexander* the Great. Now who would have thought that this (*d*) *Chuthæan* ſhould have been miſtaken, for the *Moabite* of (*e*) *Horonaim*, whom *Nehemiah* found there in *Paleſtine* 100 years before in *Artaxerxes* his time? I call *Nehemiah*'s *Sanballat* a *Moabite*, for he is join'd with *Tobia* the *Ammonite* (*f*) almoſt as oft as he is mentioned: And as *Nehemiah* obſerveth, (*g*) That the *Iſraelites* were particularly forbidden to marry with *Moab* and *Ammon*; ſo he (*h*) gives inſtances of the breach of this command in the Prieſts marrying into the Families of *Tobia* and *Sanballat*. That *Horonaim* was in *Moab*, I have ſhewn above in the (*ſee e*) Margent.

(*a*) p. 9.

(*b*) *Joſ. An.* 9. 7.
(*c*) *Joſ. An.* 9. 14.
(*d*) *Ib.* 9. 7.
(*e*) *Eſ.* 15. 5 *Jer.* 48. 3, 5, 34.
(*f*) *Neh.* 11 10, 19, *&c.*
(*g*) *Neh.* 13. 1, 23.
(*h*) *Ib.* 4. 28.

For the ſtrangeneſs of it, that there ſhould be two of a Name; that would not have ſtuck with the Objector, if he had conſidered that there were two *Artaxerxeſes*, and

three *Dariuſes* in his view. But thoſe were Kings, and they might take Names from one another: To go lower therefore, he might haye found two *Ezra*'s and two *Nehemiahs* in thoſe times; one of each ‖ came up from Captivity with *Zorobabel*; and again one of each was in the Government almoſt One hundred years after. There is no ſtrangeneſs in this, but that any Man ſhould be ſo ſenſeleſs to think theſe two Pairs were but one *Ezra* and one *Nehemiah*.

‖ Neh. 13. 1. Ezr. 11. 2.

Laſtly, For *Manaſſes* Brother of *Iaddus*, *Ioſephus* ſaith, That he marryed a Heathen Woman, *Nicaſo* the Daughter of *Sanballat* the *Chuthæan*, which occaſioned a Breach between the Brothers, and thereupon a Schiſm in the Church: This *Manaſſes* ſetting up another Temple at Mount *Garizim* in oppoſition to that at *Ieruſalem*. The Objector, to find a fault in this Story, makes many. For, *Firſt*, He confounds this Brother of *Iaddus*, with his Uncle that is mentioned by *Nehemiah*, ‖ in the end of his Book. *Nehemia* there calleth him, *one of the Sons of* Ioiada *the Son of* Eliaſhib *the High-Prieſt*, which is plain enough to ſhew, that he was younger Brother of *Iohanan* the Father of *Iaddus*: But no matter for that. The Objector to make *Ioſephus* a Lyar, makes bold with the Scripture it ſelf: He is pleas'd to give this Uncle of *Iaddus* the Name of *Manaſſes*, which *Nehemiah* never thought of: And he will have this Man to be Brother of *Iaddus*; he calleth him ſo as oft as he mentions him. And the Wife that he marryed, who was Daughter of *Sanballat* the *Horonite*, muſt be the ſame with *Nicaſo* the Daughter of *Sanballat* the *Chuthæan*. And in conſequence of all this *Ioſephus* muſt be a Liar, who writes of things as done in the time of *Darius Codomannus*, which were done long before (as our Objector ſaith,) in the time of *Artaxerxes Longimanus*.

‖ ch. 13. 28.

p. 6.

But with his leave, *Ioſephus* knew what he writ, as it appears

pears by his fixing the time of this Story: There was no date of time better known among the *Iews*, than that of the building of their Temple at *Jernſalem*; nor among the *Samaritans*, than that of the building of the Temple of *Garizim*. They remembred nothing more, than the deſtruction of their Temples: It was a thing in every ones mouth, *Our Fathers worſhip'd in this Mount*, ſaid (*a*) the Woman of *Samaria* to our Saviour. And no doubt, if they had any Records or any Hiſtories, the times of theſe things were chiefly remembred in them: But it was within 200 years of *Ioſephus* his time, that the Temple at Mount *Garizim* was deſtroyed by *Iohannes Hyrcanus*. It happen'd at a memorable time, being ſoon after the Death of *Antiochus Pius*, (which was in the year before Chriſt 130,) then that Temple was deſtroyed, ſaith *Ioſephus*, (*b*) 200 years after the building of it. How long that Temple ſtood, and when it was deſtroyed, none knew better than the *Samaritans* themſelves. And as they were Enemies to the *Iews*, ſo they muſt be particularly to that Author, who provokes them as oft as he mentions them. How then durſt he have put it in their power to diſprove him, as they certainly would, if this had not been true? I take it therefore for certain, by their account as well as his, (accounting 200 years upward from the deſtruction,) that their Temple was built in the year before Chriſt 430, which falls in the time of *Alexander* the Great, and not as the Objector would have it, in the time of *Artaxerxes Longimanus*.

(a) *Iohn* iv. 20.

(b) p. 19.

What ſaith the Objector to this? He (*c*) tells us from *David Ganz*, *That the Iewiſh Chronologers do affirm*, *That the Temple on Mount* Garizim *was built long before the times of* Alexander; *and that all the time of* Alexander, Simeon Juſtus *was High-Prieſt*; *which* Simeon *was the Grandſon of* Iaddus. The Objector tells us afterwards, *That* Calviſius, *and not only he, but all Chronologers, find* Ioſephus's *Errors and Miſtakes*

(c) *Ioſ. Ant.* xiii. 17.

ſtakes concerning thoſe times ſo many and groſs, as would make any Man that acted upon Principles of Sincerity, very fearful to uſe an Example taken out of him in Matters of Practice.

I believe the Objector *acts upon Principles of Sincerity* in other things; notwithſtanding that he ſeems to forget them in his Quotations. In theſe I muſt needs ſay, he gives great ſuſpicion of the contrary, by omitting thoſe words that make againſt him in his own Authors: Of which I ſhall give a clear proof by and by, and I doubt not you will find the like in other places of his Book.

But whereas he bringeth all Chronologers on his ſide againſt *Ioſephus*, he ſhould have excepted all the Beſt, both Ancient and Modern; and among them particularly our excellent Primate, who followeth *Ioſephus* in every part of this Story. I allow him indeed the *Iewiſh* Chronologers, who are as much the Enemies of *Ioſephus* as he is himſelf; for they have the like quarrel againſt him, becauſe he breaks all their Meaſures.

But yet the *Iewiſh* Chronologers will not help the Objector in his Cauſe. They will not make *Iaddus* live to 124 years of Age, and *Sanballat* to 145. They are ſo far from that, that they ſcarce allow either of them any Age. For they make (*d*) the whole time of the ſecond Temple at *Ieruſalem*, 'till the ſixth year of *Alexander* the Great, to be but 34 years. And in that ſixth year of *Alexander*, they ſay that he came up againſt *Ieruſalem*; and that *Iaddus* the High-Prieſt, and all the Elders of *Iſrael* came forth to him; and that they made a Covenant with *Alexander* (tho' *Darius* was then living.) This Story fills up moſt of that (*e*) very page, that our Obiector quotes in his Margent. Only there the High-Prieſt is called *Simeon* the juſt. But that this makes no difference in the Story, he might have ſeen in the paſſage (*f*) next before, where *Ganz* tells us of this *Simeon* the juſt, that his name was *Iaddua*. And for the

(*d*) *Ganz.* p. 57. & 64

(*e*) p. 59.

(*f*) *Ganz.* p. 58.

the building of the Temple at Mount *Garizim*, which as the Objector ſaith, *(g) The* Jewiſh *Chronologers affirm to have been built long before* Alexander's *time:* His *Ganz* tells us, *(h)* that ſome of their Writers have ſaid ſo; but he diſproves them, and affirms of a certainty, that it was built in *Alexander*'s time, and by his permiſſion. He doth indeed confound the two *Sanballats*, the *Chuthæan* and the *Horonite*, and makes *Manaſſes* to be the Prieſt that was depoſed in *Nehemiah*'s time. This might be excuſed in a *Iew*, that reckons that Act of *Nehemiah* but 4 years before the Reign of *Alexander* the Great: But is not to be allow'd one that reckons one hundred years between, and takes upon him to correct *Ioſephus* by Chriſtian Chronology.

(g) p. 10.

(h) p. 6. 6.

Ganz. p. 56, 57.

But beſides theſe difficulties in Chronology, which I have proved to be none; the Objector ſaith, *there are ſeverat Inconſiſtencies in the ſtory it ſelf, noted by* Salian.

That *Ieſuit* was an Enemy to the very name of *Ioſephus*, for *Scaliger*'s ſake. But without engaging in the quarrel between them, I take the *Inconſiſtencies* as they ly here before me.

Object. The firſt is, that *Ioſephus* ſaith, the *Phœnicians* and *Chaldæans*, who followed *Alexander*, when he came againſt *Ieruſalem*, thought to have plunder'd the City. Now ſaith the Objector, *How ſhould he have* Chaldæans *in his Army*, when as yet he had not taken *Babylon*, nor come near to *Chaldæa?*

Anſwer. He might have *Chaldæans* in his Army, of thoſe whom he had taken at *Iſſus*, many of whom turn'd over to *Alexander*, and ſerved him, as he *(i)* told *Darius* in his Epiſtle. But I confeſs I know not why theſe *Chaldæans* ſhould be named together with the *Phœnicians*, as if theſe two Nations ſhould be eager for the ſpoils of *Ieruſalem*, above all the reſt that were in *Alexander*'s Army. There muſt be ſome particular reaſon for this eagerneſs in theſe two Nations above others: And that probably either for their

(i) *Arrian. de exp. Alex.* ii.

their own especial gain, or for some National spite against the *Iews*. And indeed for the *Phœnicians*, the first of these Reasons is plain, because they had the chief Sea-Ports, and the Trade of that part of the World. Therefore *Tyrus* said of old (*k*) against *Ieruſalem* in the time of *Nebuchadnezzar*. *Aha! ſhe is broken, —— ſhe is turned unto me: I ſhall be repleniſht, when ſhe is laid waſte.* The ſame hope they might have now again. But this being a reaſon peculiar to the *Phœnicians*; no other Nation could be ſo intent upon the ſpoils of *Ieruſalem*, but only for ſpite, and that was not to be imagined in the *Chaldæans*; who after ſo long acquaintance as they had with the *Iews* in their Captivity, were kinder to them than any other People, and have continued ſo ever ſince. But theſe here ſpoken of muſt be Enemies of the *Jews*; and who ſhould they be of all the Nations that *Alexander* had in his Army? Of all the Nations in the World none ſo likely as the *Samaritans*. And of them *Ioſephus* told us lately before, there were 8000 ſent by *Sanballat*, that were now in the Army. But when *Ioſephus* ſpeaks of theſe People in anger, he commonly calleth them *Chuthæi*; which is ſo near the word *Chaldæi*, that I cannot forbear offering this as an Emendation of the Text: For ΧΑΛΔΑΙΩΝ write ΧΟΥΘΑΙΩΝ, and then there is no *Inconſiſtency*.

(*k*) *Ezek.* 26. 2.

The next thing might very well have been ſpared; for there is no Inconſiſtency in it: That the *Iews* when they had found favour with *Alexander*, ſhould ask the like favour for their Brethren that were in *Babylon* and *Media*. Thoſe Countreys, tho *Alexander* had not yet conquered, yet it could not be doubted, that they would be ſhortly in his hands. And that *Iaddus* askt favour for them, and that *Alexander* granted it, or rather that he promiſed it, (for ſo the *Greek* word ſignifyeth;) They are much to ſeek for Faults, that can find them in ſo clear a paſſage as this.

But

But ſuch another is that which next followeth, *viz.* That the Army was aſtoniſht to ſee *Alexander* worſhip *Jaddus*. Well they might: Though it was but Civil Worſhip; it was a wonderful thing, that ſo great a King ſhould give it to a Prieſt, or to any other humane Being.

But the fault is, that *Joſephus* ſhould put it in *Parmenio*'s Mouth to ask *Alexander*, wherefore he ſhould adore another, that was himſelf ador'd by all. It is judg'd by *Salian*, and the Objector, an inconſiſtency, to ſay that *Alexander* was ador'd, or that he believ'd himſelf the Son of *Jupiter*, before his coming into *Egypt*, &c. Yet thoſe Learned Men could not but know that adoration was paid to Eaſtern Princes, that did not believe themſelves the Sons of *Jupiter*. It was ſo far from this that it was not confin'd to Crown'd Heads. *Joſephus* * tells us in this Book, that *Haman*, being the King's Favourite, as oft as he came to Court, had adoration paid him by all, as well Strangers as *Perſians*. How much more ſhould it be paid to *Alexander* himſelf by them of the conquer'd Nations? No leſs than the Mother of *Darius*, when ſhe was taken Priſoner at *Iſſus*, and *Alexander* came to give her a Viſit, receiv'd him * with this Ceremony. She perform'd it indeed, by miſtake, to *Hephæſtion* that came with him, becauſe he made a better figure, and when ſhe underſtood her miſtake, was much out of Countenance, till the King himſelf told her it is no miſtake, he is *Alexander*. But I have not read that he told her he would not be treated with that Ceremony. It ſeems therefore he did ſuffer himſelf to be ador'd, even before his going into *Egypt*: And therefore what *Joſephus* tells us, of *Parmenio*'s ſaying thoſe Words, might be true for ought we know; howſoever he might have ſaid them without any *Inconſiſtency*.

* *Joſ.* Ant. xi. 6.

* *Plut.* in *Alex.*

The things in theſe two laſt Anſwers are ſo plain, that I cannot think how it came to paſs that the Objector did

not ſee them: unleſs it be that *Joſephus* had offended him ſo much, that he was too greedy of Objections againſt him, and did not regard what might be ſaid in his vindication.

In this angry humour he runs on in the next page. And there he calls in *Calviſius* to be his ſecond.

He could not have found a fitter Man to take his part. For he had a quarrel of his own againſt *Joſephus*, for writing ſuch things as would not conſiſt with his Chronology. But that was *Scaliger*'s fault, that had crampt that part of his Chronology, by beginning *Daniel*'s 70 Weeks in *Darius Nothus* his time. In conſequence of that, he muſt make *Nehemia*'s *Artaxerxes* to be *Mnemon* inſtead of *Longimanus*: And the *Darius* that he mentions muſt not be *Nothus*, but *Codomannns*: And if *Nehemiah* liv'd till *Codomannus* his time, ſo might his *Sanballat* as well: And then why ſhould not the Prieſt that *Nehemiah* depriv'd, be *Manaſſes*, the ſame that is mention'd in *Joſephus*? All this both *Scaliger* and *Calviſius* are for; and our Objector if he pleas'd might have quoted them for theſe things. But then his Arithmetick would have been of no uſe: For *Sanballat*'s 145 years would have been but fourſcore, *Manaſſes* might have been a young Man, and *Jaddus* of middle Age; and ſo there had been an end of all his *Inſuperable difficulties*. Thoſe two learned Men were ſo far from ſeeing any difficulty in the Story of *Jaddus*, as *Joſephus* tells it, that they take it for unqueſtionable Hiſtory. But why then doth the Objector bring in *Calviſius*, as if he were of his ſide in this Argument? He will ſay he doth not, here is no mention of *Jaddus*. Very well, but here are hard Cenſures on *Joſephus*, which being brought in in this place, tho' they do not belong to it, may ſerve as well as if they did: Though *Calviſius* intended them for things wherein *Joſephus* differ'd from him, yet the Reader may apply them to that *Story* wherein he agreed with him.

If

If the Objector dealt candidly in this, he doth not so always. We have a great instance of the contrary in his shuffling and cutting with the Convocation-Book. He against whom he writes had urg'd the Example of *Jaddus*, for something which the Objector doth not like; and to give the more Credit to it, he saith (as here he is quoted) that *whether the story be true or no, the Convocation seems to believe it.* He gives very good reason to judge so, *because they have inserted part of it into the Convocation-Book.* They have indeed taken in all that the Objector throws out, concerning *Sanballat*, and *Manasses*, and *Jaddus*; And they * expresly quote *Josephus* for it as their Author; though by making his *Sanballat* the same with *Nehemiah*'s, it appears that they follow *Scaliger* and *Calvisius* in their Chronology. But for the Story, which is so much contested by our Objector, they not only take it for an undoubted Truth, but they Reason upon it as to matter of Practice. Our Objector saith well, that *Men that have any care of their Souls will hardly venture to act upon one single Example, and that also voucht but by a single and suspicious Author.* They may do well to think of this, that go in untrodden ways, and yet damn all them that will not follow them. But it is upon the single Example of *Jaddus* having sworn to *Darius*, that the Convocation saith, that the *Jewish* High-Priests were bound to the Kings of *Persia* by an Oath, when they were made High-Priests. And they add this * judgment upon it, that *if any Man affirm — that Jaddus the High-Priest did amiss in binding his Allegiance to King Darius by an Oath, or that he had not sinn'd if he had refus'd (being thereunto requir'd) so to have sworn — he doth greatly err.* It is plain that they affirm this upon one single Example, and that also voucht but by a single Authority. They do indeed profes they do not * hold it *Canonical* no more than *the Books of the* Maccabees *and other ancient Historiographers*;

* *Convoc.* chap. 30. p. 63.

* *convoc.* can. 30. p. 65.

* chap 29. p. 64.

ſtoriographers; but neither did they judge it (as our Objector doth) to be of *Suſpicious Authority*.

He was aware how much their judgment would be preferred before his, where he differs from them. And therefore finding them againſt him in all he hath ſaid of the ſuſpiciouſneſs of this Story, he is now for compounding the Matter. As far as this Story will make on his ſide, he is content they ſhould believe it; provided they will give up that part of it for which he hath rejected the whole. That is, he is content they ſhould take *Joſephus* for a good Author, only as far as his Authority makes for the not-ſwearers. An eaſy Reader may be perſuaded to this; but not without ſome ſhew of proof. And therefore he tells you, they of the Convocation mention, and thereby approve, *Jaddus* his Anſwer to *Alexander*, *That he had ſworn Allegiance to* Darius, *and therefore could not violate his Oath ſo long as* Darius *lived*. From hence the Objector infers, that their ſenſe is, That *an Oath of Allegiance was binding to a Prince ſo long as he lived, and had not given up his right, tho he was beaten in the Field, and fled before his Enemies*. This is what the Objector would have. But the ſenſe of the Convocation will beſt appear by their own words; and thus they go on * with the Story: *Alexander by Gods Providence having vanquiſht the* Perſians; (that is, having * overthrown *Darius* the King of the *Perſians*, upon which the Monarchy of the *Græcians* began,) *the* Jews *amongſt many other Nations became* HIS SUBJECTS. *He dealt favourably with them, releaſt them of ſome Payments*, viz. from paying Tribute on the Sabbatical years, and *granted them liberty to live according to their own Laws*.

* *Convoc.* chap. 31. *beginning.*
* *Ib.* ch. 29.

Theſe laſt are the words of *Joſephus* in that very Chapter which was quoted before in the Convocation Book; and the things here ſpoken, were done by *Alexander* then when he was at *Jeruſalem*, two years before the Death of *Darius*.

Darius. In consequence hereof, the Convocation declare their * *Canon*, That *if any Man shall affirm, — That the* Jews *generally, both Priests and People, were not the* Subjects *of* Alexander *after his Authority was* setled *among them, as they had been before the Subjects of the Kings of* Babylon *and* Persia, — *he doth greatly Err.* What the Convocation did mean by the setling of an Authority, they shew* in these words, *viz.* when it is either *generally received by Subjects, or setled by continuance.* The Disjunctive is as plain in these words, as it is in those of Bishop *Buckeridge*'s, which are fairly quoted by the Objector, p. 27. but not fairly repeated in the bottom of that page. It was plainly their Judgment, that *both* these were not necessary, but that either of the two might suffice, for the setling of an Authority. But *Alexander* had one of the two, that is, the general subjection of the People; whereupon, without the other, they were his Subjects according to the Convocation-Book, as much as they had been before the Subjects of *Darius*, though he was yet living.

* *Can.* 31. p. 67.

* *Convoc.* c. 31. p. 67.

But this will not go down with the Objector. He saith, *For the other part of the Story, of* Jaddus *submitting to* Alexander *while* Darius *was living, the Convocation take no notice of it.* They do not name *Jaddus* indeed. But what saith he to these * words, that the *Jews generally both* Priests and People *were the* Subjects of ALEXANDER? Those words seem to be intended chiefly of *Jaddus*, at least they take him in among the Priests and People. But then saith the Objector, *it doth not any where appear, That they* (the Convocation,) *thought* Darius *was then living.* No: Doth it appear, that they thought what they writ? Their Book saith, *He by flight escaped, when his Army was discomfited.* And tho they do not say, he was living when *Alexander* came to *Jerusalem*, yet no Learned Man can be ignorant,

* *Can.* 31. *beginning.*

That

That he lived two years after this. But the Convocation were not concern'd whether he were living or no, any longer than while the People of God were under his Dominion. The Changes of Governments over the *Jews*, was the thing which the Convocation were to consider. And now upon this Change of Government, they tell us, That the *Jews*, *both Priests and People*, being *Subjects of Alexander*, (whether *Darius* was living or dead,) they were *bound to pray for the long life and prosperity both of* Alexander *and his Empire, as they had been bound before to pray for the long life and prosperity of the other Kings and their Kingdoms*, **while they lived under their Subjection.** Therefore when they were no longer in subjection to *Darius*, it was all one to them whether he were living or dead.

From what hath been said, the Answer is plain to his Question, concerning *Submission to a Possessor of Power, notwithstanding an Oath to a lawful King, who is alive, and insists upon his right*, whether it be *argued from the Story or from the Convocation-Book*? It may be from either or both, for ought that he hath said to the contrary: The Story hath been clear'd from all suspicion of Falshood, That he hath endeavour'd to fasten upon it. The Convocation-Book hath spoken for it self, and hath much more to say; but this little is enough to shew our Objector, that he might better have let it alone than brought it into this Controversy.

After all he comes to this, that *grant the Story true, it is not to the purpose it is urg'd for*. How so? Because this of *Jaddus* is *a singular and exempt Case*. What he did was by *especial Revelation from God*; who, as *Josephus* says, *appear'd to him in a Dream, and warn'd him to submit to* Alexander, *and to meet him in that solemn manner as he did.*

He

He is aware, that there is a prejudice against this; namely, That *Prophecy was then departed from the* Jewiſh *Church.* This is certainly true: *Malachi* having given them * warning, that the next Prophet that ſhould come, would be *Elias.* But the Objector ſhifts off this, by telling us, That *when there were no more Prophets, yet ſtill there was an inferior degree of Prophecy, which laſted for a long time, as the* Bath Kol, *and probably ſome other way, as by Dreams,* &c. * *Mal.* iv. 3.

To make way for theſe, he tells us, *it was always the Cuſtom in the* Jewiſh *Church, in caſes of great Extremity, to have recourſe to God for ſome expreſs Revelation what they ſhould do.* This is more than the *Jews* knew, or they did not think of it, at that time * when *Judas Maccabæus* being ſlain, *there was a great affliction in* Iſrael, *the like whereof was not ſince the time that a Prophet was not ſeen among them.* For then they took meer humane Counſels, without looking for any *expreſs Revelation.* That in ſuch Diſtreſſes, they uſed Faſting and Prayer, was to ſeek God for Deliverance, as hath been uſed in all Ages. And thus *Joſephus* tells us, the *Jews* did at this time when *Alexander* was coming againſt them. They faſted and prayed for a Deliverance. Thus far there is nothing ſtrange in the Hiſtory. * 1 *Macc.* ix. 27.

But then mark what follows. *The next night God appear'd to Jaddus, and order'd him ſo to do*; that is, *ſo* as he told us before, namely, *to ſubmit to* Alexander, *and to meet him as he did.* Here he would make us believe we have a Wolf by the Ears, for whether we admit this, or deny it, we are in his danger either way. If we deny this part of the Story, why may not the Objector as well deny all the reſt? But if we admit it, then it is *wholly beſide the purpoſe*: For ſaith he (with his uſual civility)

if

if these Gentlemen will shew us any express Revelation for what they do, as Jaddus *had, then they say something: But 'till they can shew that, this Example, if true, will do them no service.* He hath oblig'd me so much with this Complement, that I cannot chuse but admit, that here was *an express Revelation.* But I cannot grant him his Consequence, till I see how it follows from the Premises. In order to this, he should have told us what Revelation it was that *Jaddus* had, and what use it was for: And then have shew'd that we have the like occasion, before he had required us to shew the like Revelation. But since he is so short in his account of these things, I must be the longer in considering them more particularly.

First, Take every thing as the Objector would have it, namely, that *Jaddus* had a Revelation from God, that he should SUBMIT to *Alexander*, though *Darius* was living; and notwithstanding his Oath by which, as *Jaddus* formerly thought, he was bound to the contrary. If *Jaddus* was *then* in the right concerning the Obligation of his Oath to *Darius*, the thing that he was *now* put upon was the horrible sin of Rebellion, aggravated with perjury, and whatsoever else the Objector thinks fit to load his Brethren with: only this of *Jaddus* he tells us was a *singular and exempt Case*, for he was put upon it by Divine Revelation. But even in this case, there would have been something else necessary to engage the people to go along with him in this submission. For since now they were to look for no Prophet more, till the coming of *Elias*, as *Malachi* * told them, but were left under a strict charge to *remember the Law of Moses with the Statutes and Judgments*; this change of their Allegiance from *Darius* to *Alexander*, being as the Objector will have it, Rebellion and Perjury, than which nothing can be more contrary

* *Mal.* iv. 3.

trary to the Law of God; how could *Jaddus* hope to bring them to this, by telling them only that he had a Revelation from God? He could not pretend to it, without making himſelf as great a Prophet as thoſe were by whom thoſe Precepts were given. And then he muſt prove it, by ſhewing ſuch ſigns as thoſe former Prophets did: Otherwiſe the *Jews* were ſo far from being bound to believe him, that they were to look upon him as a falſe Prophet, and as ſuch to put him to death. We ſee how ready the *Jews* were to Execute this upon our Saviour, as oft as he ſeem'd to teach any thing contrary to their Law, though he did prove himſelf a Prophet by the working of Miracles. But *Joſephus* doth not tell us, that *Jaddus* did any Miracle; (if he had, we ought not to have believed him;) and yet the *Jewiſh* Church at that time, was ſo far from ſtoning *Jaddus* for pretending this Revelation, that they all join'd with him in ſubmitting to *Alexander*, even while *Darius* was living. And therefore we may be ſure, that this Revelation was not againſt their *common and ſtanding Rules*, as our Objector would have it.

It was ſo very agreeable to them, that if the Matter of the Revelation were as he reports it, there could be no reaſon given why *Jaddus* ſhould have a Revelation, but this, that God ſaw it neceſſary for the correcting of that former Error of *Jaddus*, by which, if he had run on it, and ſtood out pertinaciouſly againſt *Alexander*, (as ſome do againſt Their preſent *Majeſties*,) it had been a cer-

tain way to have deſtroyed the *Jewiſh* Church. Bleſſed be God, that hath preſerv'd our Church, by letting us ſee, that our Submiſſion is ſo agreeable to the Rules of our Religion and to the Practice of his Church in all Ages, that there is no need of proving it to be our Duty that way which the Objector requires, namely, by *an expreſs Revelation.*

But what if there was nothing of Submiſſion to *Alexander* in the Revelation that was made to *Jaddus?* Then thoſe words upon which all his Argument moves, namely, the words TO SUBMIT, were thruſt in by the Objector. If he did this by miſtake, he may eaſily correct it, by reading the place in *Joſephus.* There he will find nothing of any Revelation that *Iaddus* had *to ſubmit and to meet* Alexander: There was no occaſion for it. For thus far he had determin'd already, before the Prayer and Faſting, upon which he had this Revelation. Theſe are *Ioſephus* his words; Alexander *having taken* Gaza, *made haſte to go up to* Jeruſalem. *The High Prieſt* Jaddus *upon the hearing of this, was in an Agony of fear; being at his wits end to think how he ſhould* MEET *the* Macedons; *the King being angry at his Diſobedience formerly.* It ſeems he was reſolved to have no more anger on that account, but to make his Peace by an humble Submiſſion: And therefore he was in care how to *meet the* Macedons, ſaith *Ioſephus.* Who thus goes on, *having therefore order'd the People to make Supplications, and himſelf with them offering*

ing

ing Sacrifice to God, he beſought him to protect the Nation, and to deliver them from the imminent dangers. It is plain, that theſe were Prayers for Deliverance, and not for a Revelation, as the Objector is pleas'd to ſay. But was there not a Revelation after this? Yes, it follows, That *after the Sacrifice, when he was gone to bed, in his ſleep, God bad him be of good courage; and let them Crown the City, and open their Gates; and for their* MEETING, (which they had reſolved before, but were in care how to do it, ſo as might move the Kings favour or compaſſion,) *Let them go,* (ſaith he,) *the reſt in White Garments, but he with the Prieſts in thoſe Veſtments which the Law hath preſcrib'd, and be confident they ſhall ſuffer no evil, for that God will provide for them:* Here is every word of the Revelation; in which, God that beſt knew what a Dream he had ſent to *Alexander* before his coming out of *Macedonia,* now orders *Iaddus* to put himſelf into that Dreſs in which *Alexander* had ſeen him in that Dream. This was a likely way indeed to ſtrike an awe into the Conqueror, and to make him reverence the Prieſt of that God by whoſe Conduct he had gotten thoſe Victories. And it had that effect, as *Joſephus* tells us. *Alexander* did acknowledge this was he that firſt invited him over into *Aſia. I ſaw him then* (ſaith he,) *in the ſame habit:— I never ſaw any other in ſuch a Robe: And now ſeeing him, and remembring my Dream, I am ſatisfyed it was God that ſent me on this Expedition,* &c.

It appears that *Jaddus* had a direction from God in what manner he ſhould meet *Alexander*, ſo as not only to pacify his wrath, but to recommend himſelf into his favour. For the *Command* of Submiſſion, which is not in *Ioſephus*, there was no need of that, for the People had determined to ſubmit, being not able to reſiſt. But if it had been as the Objector imagins, yet it would do him no Service, as I have ſufficiently ſhewn: And therefore after all that he hath ſaid, this Story of *Iaddus* affords us a very good unqueſtionable inſtance of the judgment of the *Iewiſh* Church in his Age; that it is lawful to ſubmit to a Prince that comes in by Conqueſt, and that it is our Duty to pay Allegiance to him as his Subjects, when he is ſetled by the general conſent of the People, notwithſtanding an Oath to a former King who is yet living.

One thing the Objector hath to ſay againſt this, which I think was put out of it's place, and ought to come in here for a Reſerve. In caſe it appear'd that the Story of *Iaddus* was not only true, but to our purpoſe, then it had been time for him to tell us, that all this is nothing to him and his party. They care not what *Iaddus* did, they know what they will do. He ſaith this
*p. 11. in effect, in the following * words, *The Practice of the High Prieſt in that corrupt State of the* Jewiſh *Church, will not ſignify much to us, and no more in this, than in their other Immoralities.* This was

was frankly ſaid, but I think not very ingenuouſly.

Firſt, He ſpeaks as if *Iaddus* were ſingle in this Act of Submiſſion; when it is evident, that the whole Church of God at that time, went along with him: And the *Iews generally, both Prieſts and People were Subjects to* Alexander, in the words of the Convocation Book.

He tells us of *that corrupt ſtate of the Jewiſh Church* in *Jaddus*'s time: This is news. All Ancient Writers ſpeak of thoſe times as the beſt that ever were under the ſecond Temple. The Church was much reform'd by thoſe excellent Men that flouriſhed in the Age next before; namely by *Nehemiah* the Governour, *Ezra* Prieſt and Scribe, and *Malachi* the laſt of the Prophets. At this very time, beſide *Iaddus* himſelf, whom the Jews * make the laſt of the Men of the *great Synagogue*; there was alſo *Boſira*, as * they tell us, a ſhining Light to the *Iſraelites*, and one that much advanc'd the honour of our God. After them was *Onias* the High-Prieſt, and his Son *Simon*, whoſe praiſe ſwells a * Chapter in *Eccleſiaſticus*. His branding of thoſe excellent Men, and the Church of God in thoſe times, may teach us to bear the Characters he gives us the more patiently. So likewiſe, when he ſaith their Practice *will ſignifie no more to us in this, than in their other Immoralities*. The meaning is, there muſt be *other Immoralities* in them that differ from him in his point.

* *Ganz.* p. 58.

* *Ganz.* p. 66.

* *Eccl.* 50.

point. So here we have a Teſt, to try who are, and who are not honeſt Men.

Yet I dare be bold to ſay, he never found *Iaddus* charged with any Immorality whatſoever. Nor we have not found him in any Error but this, that he thought himſelf bound to *Darius* while he was living. This was an Error indeed, if he meant as the Words ſtrictly ſignifie. For an Oath of Allegiance to any King, can bind one no longer than while he is that King's Subject. It doth not bind, ſaith the * Objector, in caſe of Ceſſion or Submiſſion. Nor, ſay other Divines, in Caſe of Conqueſt: And *Iaddus*, when he became ſubject to *Alexander*, was plainly of this later Opinion, by which he explain'd or corrected what he ſaid formerly.

* p. 19. 20, 21.

Now *Iaddus* being a Man of that high place in the Church, of ſo clear a Repute ever ſince in all Ages; what ſhould make the Objector and his Party (which I hope is not great) make ſo light of ſuch an eminent and venerable Example? He tells us *Iaddus becoming a Subject to* Alexander *contrary to his Oath, is no more a Pattern for us to follow, than* Eliaſhib's *building a Chamber in the Temple for* Tobia, *is an Argument for us to act contrary to the expreſs Laws of God.* This is home to the purpoſe, and being ſaid at the firſt, might have ſav'd him and me all this trouble.

Now

Now all the Queſtion is, whether *Jaddus* acted contrary to his Oath to *Darius*, in becoming a Subject to *Alexander*. To judge aright of this Queſtion, we muſt conſider what Circumſtances he was in at the taking of this Oath, and how they were chang'd at the time of his ſubmitting to *Alexander*.

Firſt, He was a Subject to *Darius* before the taking of this Oath: and by it he gave no other right to *Darius*, than what he had before, he gave him only a greater aſſurance.

Secondly, The right that *Darius* had over the *Iews*, was no other than what deſcended to him from *Cyrus*: And that was by his Conqueſt over the *Babylonians*, that were their former Lords.

Thirdly, That right of Conqueſt being deſcended to this *Darius*, was won from him by *Alexander*, that had overcome him in War, and ſo made himſelf Lord of that Country, and ſo *Alexander* now had the ſame right to their Allegiance which *Darius* had before.

Fourthly, His right to their Allegiance being ceaſed, their Oath to him was of no Obligation: But they were as free, and had as much reaſon to pay their Allegiance now to *Alexander*, as they had formerly to *Darius* or *Cyrus*.

This

This ſeems to be the ground that *Iaddus* went upon. And if it was, he had reaſon to think he did not contrary to his Oath. For he kept it to the laſt, till there was no ſuch King as he had ſworn to: And then, having no Revelation to Guide him, he yielded to the Providence of God, in ſubmitting to him that had won the Kingdom from *Darius*.

The Objector having ſaid, becauſe he will have it ſo, that this Submiſſion of *Iaddus* was contrary to his Oath; goes on, and compares it with that Fact of *Elaſhib*, which the Scripture it ſelf ſaith, was contrary to expreſs Laws of God. And therefore he would have us take heed of following *Iaddus* for our Pattern; as if we were as well aſſur'd of what he ſaith, as we are of what we read in the Scripture.

He values his own Opinion too much, that would impoſe it upon others at this rate.

And yet he that will not ſubmit to it, falls under all the heavy Cenſures of his Book. They muſt be *Deſerters of Principles*, and guilty of *Rebellion* and *Perjury*; and why not? Should we think to come off better than *Iaddus* who is condemned already, and with him all the *Iewiſh* Church of that Age. But all other Churches of God have done like them, as oft as they have come into their Circumſtances.

I do not except that which he fills his Book with namely the *Iewiſh* Church in *Iehoiada*'s time; for they were in much different Circumſtances, as I doubt not you will ſhew. He cannot pretend to ſhew, that any other Church hath done otherwiſe then that under *Iaddus*, which he hath condemned already. He will ſhortly ſee, that they are all againſt him in this Cauſe; and then we are to expect the like Judgment upon all Churches, *Iewiſh* and *Chriſtian*; unleſs the Objector think better, and change his mind, or at leaſt forbear ſuch unjuſt and uncharitable Cenſures, which I wiſh he may both for his own and for the Churches ſake.

This I hope will be the Fruit of your Anſwer to his Poſtſcript, which is earneſtly expected by

S I R,

Your Friend and Servant.

A Catalogue of Books sold by Thomas Jones *at the* White-Horse *without* Temple-Barr.

I. SIR *John Chardins* Travels into *Persia*, &c. *Folio.*

II. *A Moral Essay upon the Soul of Man:* Containing, 1. The Preference due to the Soul above the Body, from the reason of it's Spiritual and Immortal Nature. 2. Of our Duties of Religion and of Morality, whether towards God, whether towards our selves, whether towards Man, and of our Duty of all Gospel Self-denial; which result from the manner how our Souls *Are* and *Operate* in our Bodies under the Visible Empire of God. 3. Concerning our Duties of Time and Eternity, of the present Life and of the Life to come, of the present World and of the World to come; which result from the manner how our Souls ought to be out of our Bodies, first of all; and then in our Spiritualiz'd Bodies after the Universal Resurrection. *Octavo.*

III. A Pious Office for sick and weak Persons; wherein many Directions and useful Instructions are given them; with Supplications, Prayers, and Meditations, proper for their Condition. *Octavo.*

IV. Weeks-Exercise. *Twelves.*

V. In the Press, A choice Collection of Lessons for 2 and 3 Flutes. With an Addition of Aires, in Three Parts, for Violins, *&c.*